arXiv:1703.00774v1 [math.AP] 2 Mar 2017

HÖLDER CONTINUITY OF WEAK SOLUTIONS TO ROUGH INFINITELY DEGENERATE EQUATIONS

LYUDMILA KOROBENKO, CRISTIAN RIOS, ERIC SAWYER, AND RUIPENG SHEN

Abstract. We obtain a generalization of the DeGiorgi Lemma to the infinitely degenerate regime and apply it to obtain sharp Hölder continuity of weak solutions to certain infinitely degenerate equations. This establishes Hölder continuity for the same weak solutions that were proved to be locally bounded in [KoRiSaSh2].

Contents

1. Introduction 1
1.1. Preliminaries and definitions 2
1.2. Control balls 3
1.3. Higher dimensions 5
2. Proportional vanishing 5
2.1. The DeGiorgi Lemma 7
3. Hölder continuity of locally bounded weak solutions 7
3.1. Proof of Theorem 2 9
References 10

1. Introduction

In [KoRiSaSh2], building on work from [KoRiSaSh1], local boundedness was established for weak subsolutions to certain infinitely degenerate elliptic divergence form equations, motivated by the pioneering work of Fedii [Fe], Kusuoka and Strook [KuStr], Morimoto [Mor] and Christ [Chr]. The main theorem on local boundedness in [KoRiSaSh2] included this.

Theorem 1 ([KoRiSaSh2]). *Suppose that $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \geq 3$ and that*

$$\mathcal{L}u \equiv \operatorname{div} \mathcal{A}(x,u) \nabla u, \qquad x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in D,$$

where $\mathcal{A}(x,z) \sim \begin{bmatrix} I_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & f(x_1)^2 \end{bmatrix}$, I_{n-1} is the $(n-1)\times(n-1)$ identity matrix, $\mathcal{A}$ has bounded measurable components, and the geometry $F = -\ln f$ satisfies the structure conditions in Definition 6 below.

1. *If $F \leq D_\sigma$ for some $0 < \sigma < 1$, then every weak solution to $\mathcal{L}u = \phi$ with A-admissible ϕ is locally bounded in D.*
2. *Conversely, if $n \geq 3$ and $\sigma > 1$, then there exists an unbounded weak solution u in a neighbourhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n$ to the equation $Lu = 0$ with geometry $F = D_\sigma$.*

The purpose of this paper is to improve the local boundedness conclusion in part (1) of Theorem 1 to include Hölder continuity. Here is our main theorem on Hölder continuity of weak solutions to certain infinitely degenerate elliptic equations.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \geq 2$ and that*

$$\mathcal{L}u \equiv \operatorname{div} \mathcal{A}(x,u) \nabla u, \qquad x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in \Omega,$$

Date: March 3, 2017.

where

$$\mathcal{A}(x,z) \sim M_F(x) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} I_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & f(x_1)^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

I_{n-1} is the $(n-1)\times(n-1)$ identity matrix, $\mathcal{A}$ has bounded measurable components, and the geometry $F=-\ln f$ satisfies the structure conditions in Definition 6 below. If $F(r)\leq Cr^{-\sigma}$ for some $0<\sigma<1$, then every weak solution to $\mathcal{L}u=0$ is Hölder continuous in Ω. More precisely, there is $\gamma>0$ such that for all compact subsets K of Ω,

$$\|u\|_{C^{\gamma}(K)} \leq C'_K \left(1+\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right).$$

By part (2) of Theorem 1, the conclusion of Hölder continuity in dimension $n\geq 3$ cannot extend to geometries $F(r)\equiv r^{-\sigma}$ for any $\sigma>1$, since then there exists an *unbounded* weak solution u in a neighbourhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n$ to the equation $\operatorname{div} M_F(x)\nabla u=0$.

1.1. **Preliminaries and definitions.** We recall some of the terminology and definitions from [KoRiSaSh1] and [KoRiSaSh2] that we use here. Let $A(x)$ be a nonnegative semidefinite $n\times n$ matrix valued function in a bounded domain $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$. We consider the second order *special* quasilinear equation ('special' because only u, and not ∇u, appears nonlinearly),

$$\mathcal{L}u \equiv \nabla^{\mathrm{tr}}\mathcal{A}(x,u(x))\nabla u = \phi, \qquad x\in\Omega,$$

and we assume the following quadratic form condition on the quasilinear matrix $\mathcal{A}(x,u(x))$,

$$k\,\xi^T A(x)\xi \leq \xi^T \mathcal{A}(x,z)\xi \leq K\,\xi^T A(x)\xi\ , \tag{1.1}$$

for a.e. $x\in\Omega$ and all $z\in\mathbb{R}$, $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n$. Here k,K are positive constants and we assume that $A(x)=B(x)^{\mathrm{tr}}B(x)$ where $B(x)$ is a Lipschitz continuous $n\times n$ real-valued matrix defined for $x\in\Omega$. We also consider the linear equation

$$Lu \equiv \nabla^{\mathrm{tr}}A(x)\nabla u = \phi, \qquad x\in\Omega,$$

and define the A-gradient by

$$\nabla_A = B(x)\nabla\ . \tag{1.2}$$

Definition 3. *The degenerate Sobolev space $W^{1,2}_A(\Omega)$ is normed by*

$$\|v\|_{W^{1,2}_A} \equiv \sqrt{\int_\Omega \left(|v|^2+\nabla v^{\mathrm{tr}}A\nabla v\right)} = \sqrt{\int_\Omega \left(|v|^2+|\nabla_A v|^2\right)}.$$

Definition 4. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Assume that $\phi\in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$. We say that $u\in W^{1,2}_A(\Omega)$ is a* weak solution *to $\mathcal{L}u=\phi$ provided*

$$-\int_\Omega \nabla w(x)^{\mathrm{tr}}\mathcal{A}(x,u(x))\nabla u = \int_\Omega \phi w$$

for all $w\in\left(W^{1,2}_A\right)_0(\Omega)$, where $\left(W^{1,2}_A\right)_0(\Omega)$ denotes the closure in $W^{1,2}_A(\Omega)$ of the subspace of Lipschitz continuous functions with compact support in Ω.

Note that our quadratic form condition (1.1) implies that the integral on the left above is absolutely convergent, and our assumption that $\phi\in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ implies that the integral on the right above is absolutely convergent. Weak sub and super solutions are defined by replacing $=$ with $\geq$ and $\leq$ respectively in the display above.

Given a geometry $F=-\ln f$, we define the balls B to be the control balls associated with the $n\times n$ matrix $M_F(x)=\begin{bmatrix} I_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & f(x_1)^2 \end{bmatrix}$. Assuming the structure conditions in Definition 6 below, we recall from [KoRiSaSh1] that the Lebesgue measure of the *two* dimensional ball $B_{2D}(x,r)$ centered at $x\in\mathbb{R}^2$ with radius $r>0$ satisfies

$$|B_{2D}(x,r)| \approx \begin{cases} r^2 f(x_1) & \text{if} \quad r\leq \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|} \\ \frac{f(x_1+r)}{|F'(x_1+r)|^2} & \text{if} \quad r\geq \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|} \end{cases}\ . \tag{1.3}$$

Definition 5. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $A(x)$ be a nonnegative semidefinite $n \times n$ matrix valued function as above. Fix $x \in \Omega$ and $\rho > 0$. We say ϕ is* A-admissible *at (x, ρ) if*

$$\|\phi\|_{X(B(x,\rho))} \equiv \sup_{v \in \left(W_A^{1,1}\right)_0(B(x,\rho))} \frac{\int_{B(x,\rho)} |v\phi| \, dy}{\int_{B(x,\rho)} \|\nabla_A v\| \, dy} < \infty.$$

Definition 6 (structure conditions)**.** *We refer to the following five conditions on $F : (0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ as* structure conditions*:*

(1) $\lim_{x \to 0^+} F(x) = +\infty$*;*
(2) $F'(x) < 0$ *and* $F''(x) > 0$ *for all* $x \in (0, R)$*;*
(3) $\frac{1}{C} |F'(r)| \leq |F'(x)| \leq C |F'(r)|$ *for* $\frac{1}{2} r < x < 2r < R$*;*
(4) $\frac{1}{-xF'(x)}$ *is increasing in the interval* $(0, R)$ *and satisfies* $\frac{1}{-xF'(x)} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ *for* $x \in (0, R)$*;*
(5) $\frac{F''(x)}{-F'(x)} \approx \frac{1}{x}$ *for* $x \in (0, R)$*.*

Remark 7. *We make no smoothness assumption on f other than the existence of the second derivative f'' on the open interval $(0, R)$. Note also that at one extreme, f can be of finite type, namely $f(x) = x^\alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$, and at the other extreme, f can be of strongly degenerate type, namely $f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{x^\alpha}}$ for any $\alpha > 0$. Assumption (1) rules out the elliptic case $f(0) > 0$.*

Notation 8. *We refer to a function F satisfying the structure conditions in Definition 6 as a 'geometry' since $F = -\ln f$ then specifies the nonnegative semidefinite matrix $M_F = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & f(x_1)^2 \end{bmatrix}$ and hence the geometry of the associated control balls. The class of degenerate elliptic linear operators*

$$Lu = \operatorname{div} A(x) \nabla u, \qquad A(x) \sim M_F(x_1),$$

is also specified along with the associated class of quasilinear operators

$$\mathcal{L}u = \operatorname{div} \mathcal{A} \nabla u, \qquad \mathcal{A}(x, z) \sim M_F(x_1).$$

1.2. **Control balls.** We now recall further notation from [KoRiSaSh1] and [KoRiSaSh2], beginning with the case of $n = 2$ dimensions. Let $d(x, y)$ be the control metric on an open subset Ω of the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ that is associated with the matrix A, and refer to the associated balls as control balls, subunit balls, or A-balls. Now we recall the definition of "height" of an arbitrary A-ball. Let $X = (x_1, 0)$ be a point on the positive x-axis and let r be a positive real number. Let the upper half of the boundary of the ball $B(X, r)$ be given as the graph of the function $\varphi(x)$, $x_1 - r < x < x_1 + r$. Denote by $\beta_{X,P}$ the geodesic that meets the boundary of the ball $B(X, r)$ at the point $P = (x_1 + r^*, h)$ where $\beta_{X,P}$ has a vertical tangent at P, $r^* = r^*(x_1, r)$ and $h = h(x_1, r) = \varphi(x_1 + r^*)$. Here both r^* and h are *functions* of the two independent variables x_1 and r, but we will often write $r^* = r^*(x_1, r)$ and $h = h(x_1, r)$ for convenience. We refer to $h = h(x_1, r)$ as the *height* of the ball $B((x_1, 0), r)$. In [KoRiSaSh1] the authors proved the following estimates on the height.

Proposition 9. *Let $\beta_{X,P}$, r^* and h be defined as above. Define $\lambda(x)$ implicitly by*

$$r = \int_{x_1}^{x} \frac{\lambda(x)}{\sqrt{\lambda(x)^2 - f(u)^2}} du.$$

Then

(1) *For $x_1 - r < x < x_1 + r$ we have $\varphi(x) \leq \varphi(x_1 + r^*) = h$.*
(2) *If $r \geq \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|}$, then*

$$h \approx \frac{f(x_1 + r)}{|F'(x_1 + r)|} \text{ and } r - r^* \approx \frac{1}{|F'(x_1 + r)|}.$$

(3) *If $r \leq \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|}$, then*

$$h \approx r f(x_1) \text{ and } r - r^* \approx r.$$

Now consider a sequence of metric balls $\{B(x, r_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ centered at $x \in \Omega$ with radii $r_k \searrow 0$ such that $r_0 = r$ and

$$|B(x, r_k) \setminus B(x, r_{k+1})| \approx |B(x, r_{k+1})|, \qquad k \geq 1,$$

so that $B(x,r_k)$ is divided into two parts having comparable area. We may in fact assume that

$$r_{k+1} = \begin{cases} r^*(x_1,r_k) & \text{if } r_k \geq \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|} \\ \frac{1}{2}r_k & \text{if } r_k < \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|} \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

where r^* is defined in Proposition 9. Now for $x_1, t > 0$ define

$$h^*(x_1,t) = \int_{x_1}^{x_1+t} \frac{f^2(u)}{\sqrt{f^2(x_1+t)-f^2(u)}}du,$$

so that $h^*(x_1,t)$ describes the 'height' above x_2 at which the geodesic through $x=(x_1,x_2)$ curls back toward the y-axis at the point $(x_1+t, x_2+h^*(x_1,t))$. Then in the case $r_k \geq \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|}$, we have $h^*(x_1,r_{k+1}) = h(x_1,r_k)$, $k \geq 0$, where $h(x_1,r_k)$ is the height of $B(x,r_k)$. In the opposite case $r_k < \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|}$, we have $r_{k+1} = \frac{1}{2}r_k$ instead, and we will estimate differently.

For $k \geq 0$ define

$$E(x,r_k) \equiv \begin{cases} \{y : x_1+r_{k+1} \leq y_1 < x_1+r_k,\ |y_2| < h^*(x_1,y_1-x_1)\} & \text{if} \quad r_k \geq \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|} \\ \{y : x_1+r_{k+1} \leq y_1 < x_1+r_k,\ |y_2| < h^*(x_1,r_k^*) = h(x_1,r_k)\} & \text{if} \quad r_k < \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|} \end{cases},$$

where we have written $r_k^* = r^*(x_1,r_k)$ for convenience. In [KoRiSaSh1] it was shown that

$$|E(x,r_k)| \approx \left|E(x,r_k)\bigcap B(x,r_k)\right| \approx |B(x,r_k)| \text{ for all } k \geq 1, \tag{1.5}$$

and hence that

$$|E(x,r_k)\cap B(x,r_k)| \geq \frac{1}{2}cr_k f(x_1) r_k \approx |B(x,r_k)| \geq |E(x,r_k)\cap B(x,r_k)|.$$

Now define $\Gamma(x,r)$ to be the set

$$\Gamma(x,r) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E(x,r_k).$$

The following lemma was proved in [KoRiSaSh1].

Lemma 10. *With notation as above, in particular with $r_0 = r$ and r_1 given by (1.4), and assuming $\int_{E(x,r_1)} w = 0$, we have the subrepresentation formula*

$$w(x) \leq C\int_{\Gamma(x,r)} |\nabla_A w(y)| \frac{\widehat{d}(x,y)}{|B(x,d(x,y))|}dy, \tag{1.6}$$

where ∇_A is as in (1.2) and

$$\widehat{d}(x,y) \equiv \min\left\{d(x,y), \frac{1}{|F'(x_1+d(x,y))|}\right\}.$$

Note that when $f(r) = r^N$ is finite type, then $\widehat{d}(x,y) \approx d(x,y)$. Now define

$$K_r(x,y) \equiv \frac{\widehat{d}(x,y)}{|B(x,d(x,y))|}\mathbf{1}_{\Gamma(x,r)}(y), \tag{1.7}$$

and for

$$y \in \Gamma(x,r) = \{y \in B(x,r) : x_1 \leq y_1 \leq x_1+r,\ |y_2-x_2| < h_{x,y}\},$$

let $h_{x,y} = h^*(x_1,y_1-x_1)$. Denote the dual cone $\Gamma^*(y,r)$ by

$$\Gamma^*(y,r) \equiv \{x \in B(y,r) : y \in \Gamma(x,r)\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^*(y,r) &= \{x \in B(y,r) : x_1 \leq y_1 \leq x_1+r,\ |y_2-x_2| < h_{x,y}\} \\ &= \{x \in B(y,r) : y_1-r \leq x_1 \leq y_1,\ |x_2-y_2| < h_{x,y}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

and consequently we get the 'straight across' estimate,

$$\int K_r(x,y)\ dx \approx \int_{y_1-r}^{y_1}\left\{\int_{y_2-h_{x,y}}^{y_2+h_{x,y}} \frac{1}{h_{x,y}}dx_2\right\}dx_1 \approx \int_{x_1}^{x_1+r} dy_1 = r\ . \tag{1.9}$$

1.3. **Higher dimensions.** Recall that in the two dimensional case, we have

$$|B_{2D}(x, d(x,y))| \approx h_{x,y}\widehat{d}(x,y) \approx h_{x,y} \min\left\{d(x,y), \frac{1}{|F'(x_1 + d(x,y))|}\right\}.$$

In the three dimensional case, the quantities $h_{x,y}$ and $\widehat{d}(x,y)$ remain formally the same (see Chapter 10 of [KoRiSaSh1]) and we can write a typical geodesic in the form

$$\begin{cases} x_2 = C_2 \pm k\int_0^{x_1} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - [f(u)]^2}}\, du \\ x_3 = C_3 \pm \int_0^{x_1} \frac{[f(u)]^2}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - [f(u)]^2}}\, du \end{cases},$$

so that a metric ball centered at $y = (y_1, y_2, y_3)$ with radius $r > 0$ is given by

$$B(y,r) \equiv \left\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : (x_1, x_3) \in B_{2D}\left((y_1, y_3), \sqrt{r^2 - |x_2 - y_2|^2}\right)\right\},$$

where $B_{2D}(a,s)$ denotes the 2-dimensional control ball centered at a in the plane parallel to the x_1, x_3-plane with radius s that was associated with f above (see Corollaries 107 and 108 in [KoRiSaSh1] and the subsequent paragraph).

In dimension $n \geq 4$, the same arguments show that a typical geodesic has the form

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{C}_2 \pm \mathbf{k}\int_0^{x_1} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - [f(u)]^2}}\, du \\ x_3 = C_3 \pm \int_0^{x_1} \frac{[f(u)]^2}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - [f(u)]^2}}\, du \end{cases},$$

where $\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{C}_2, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ are now $(n-2)$-dimensional vectors, so that a metric ball centered at

$$y = (y_1, \mathbf{y}_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \times \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with radius $r > 0$ is given by

$$B(y,r) \equiv \left\{(x_1, \mathbf{x}_2, x_3) : (x_1, x_3) \in B_{2D}\left((y_1, y_3), \sqrt{r^2 - |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}_2|^2}\right)\right\},$$

where $B_{2D}(a,s)$ denotes the 2-dimensional control ball centered at a in the plane parallel to the x_1, x_3-plane with radius s that was associated with f above. The following lemma was proved in [KoRiSaSh2], correcting Lemma 109 in Chapter 10 of [KoRiSaSh1].

Lemma 11. *The Lebesgue measure of the* three *dimensional ball $B_{3D}(x,r)$ satisfies*

$$|B_{3D}(x,r)| \approx \begin{cases} r^3 f(x_1) & \text{if} \quad r \leq \frac{2}{|F'(x_1)|} \\ \frac{f(x_1+r)}{|F'(x_1+r)|^3}\sqrt{r|F'(x_1+r)|} & \text{if} \quad r \geq \frac{2}{|F'(x_1)|} \end{cases},$$

and that of the n-dimensional ball $B_{nD}(x,r)$ satisfies

$$|B_{nD}(x,r)| \approx \begin{cases} r^n f(x_1) & \text{if} \quad r \leq \frac{2}{|F'(x_1)|} \\ \frac{f(x_1+r)}{|F'(x_1+r)|^n}\left(r|F'(x_1+r)|\right)^{\frac{n}{2}-1} & \text{if} \quad r \geq \frac{2}{|F'(x_1)|} \end{cases}.$$

2. Proportional vanishing

Now we consider a generalization of the subrepresentation inequality in Lemma 10 and an application to a 'DeGiorgi Lemma' for an infinitely degenerate gradient. Our generalization consists in replacing the assumption that $\int_{E(x,r_1)} w = 0$ in Lemma 10 by the following weaker assumption: There is $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$|\{y \in E(x,r_1) : w(y) = 0\}| \geq \alpha |B(x,r_1)|. \tag{2.1}$$

Note that the assumption $\int_{E(x,r_1)} w = 0$, together with $w \geq 0$, in Lemma 10 trivially implies (2.1) with $\alpha = \frac{|E(x,r_1)|}{|B(x,r_1)|}$.

Lemma 12. *Assume notation as above, namely that $r_0 = r$, that r_1 is given by (1.4), that ∇_A is as in (1.2) and that*

$$\widehat{d}(x,y) \equiv \min\left\{d(x,y), \frac{1}{|F'(x_1 + d(x,y))|}\right\}.$$

If there is $\alpha > 0$ such that (2.1) holds, then we have the subrepresentation formula

$$w(x) \leq C\frac{1}{\alpha}\int_{\Gamma(x,r)} |\nabla_A w(y)| \frac{\widehat{d}(x,y)}{|B(x,d(x,y))|}dy. \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. Let $F(x,r_1) \equiv \{y \in E(x,r_1) : w(y) = 0\}$. Then from (2.1) we have

$$1 \leq \frac{|E(x,r_1)|}{|F(x,r_1)|} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} < \infty,$$

Proceeding the same way as in Lemma 10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|E(x,r_k)|}\int_{E(x,r_k)} w(y)\,dy \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left\{\frac{1}{|E(x,r_{k+1})|}\int_{E(x,r_{k+1})} w(y)\,dy - \frac{1}{|E(x,r_k)|}\int_{E(x,r_k)} w(z)\,dz\right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|E(x,r_1)|}\int_{E(x,r_1)} w(z)\,dz. \end{aligned}$$

The infinite sum on the right hand side can be estimated in exactly the same way as in Lemma 10 to obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left\{\frac{1}{|E(x,r_{k+1})|}\int_{E(x,r_{k+1})} w(y)\,dy - \frac{1}{|E(x,r_k)|}\int_{E(x,r_k)} w(z)\,dz\right\} \lesssim \int_{\Gamma(x,r)} |\nabla_A w(y)| \frac{\widehat{d}(x,y)}{|B(x,d(x,y))|}dy.$$

We therefore proceed to estimate the last term. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|E(x,r_1)|}\int_{E(x,r_1)} w(z)\,dz &= \frac{1}{|E(x,r_1)|}\int_{E(x,r_1)} w(z)\,dz - \frac{1}{|F(x,r_1)|}\int_{F(x,r_1)} w(z)\,dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|E(x,r_1)|\,|F(x,r_1)|}\iint_{E(x,r_1)\times F(x,r_1)} |w(y)-w(z)|dydz \end{aligned}$$

So it remains to prove that

$$\frac{1}{|E(x,r_1)|\,|F(x,r_1)|}\iint_{E(x,r_1)\times F(x,r_1)} |w(y)-w(z)|dydz \lesssim \frac{1}{\alpha}\int_{\Gamma(x,r)} |\nabla_A w(y)| \frac{\widehat{d}(x,y)}{|B(x,d(x,y))|}dy,$$

which follows from the arguments used in the proof of Lemma 10. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\iint_{E(x,r_1)\times F(x,r_1)} |w(y)-w(z)|dydz \\ \lesssim\ &\int_{E(x,r_1)\times F(x,r_1)} \{|w(y_1,y_2)-w(z_1,y_2)| + |w(z_1,y_2)-w(z_1,z_2)|\}\,dydz \\ \lesssim\ &\int_{E(x,r_1)\times F(x,r_1)}\int_{y_1}^{z_1} |w_x(s,y_2)|\,dsdy_1dy_2dz_1dz_2 \\ &+ \int_{E(x,r_1)\times F(x,r_1)}\int_{y_2}^{z_2} |w_y(z_1,t)|\,dtdy_1dy_2dz_1dz_2 \end{aligned}$$

which is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_{HB_1(x)} |\nabla_A w(s,y_2)|\,dsdy_2\right)\{r_1-r_2\}\int_{HB_1(x)} dz_1dz_2 \\ &+ \left(\int_{HB_1(x)} |\nabla_A w(z_1,t)|\,dz_1dt\right)\ \frac{h_1}{f(x_1+r_2)}\ \int_{HB_1(x)} dy_1dy_2\ . \end{aligned}$$

Now we proceed, just as in the proof of Lemma 10 above, by considering separately the two cases $d(x,y) \geq \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|}$ and $d(x,y) < \frac{1}{|F'(x_1)|}$, to obtain finally that

$$\frac{1}{|E(x,r_1)|\,|F(x,r_1)|}\iint_{E(x,r_1)\times F(x,r_1)} |w(y)-w(z)|dydz \leq C\frac{1}{\alpha}\int_{\Gamma(x,r)} |\nabla_A w(y)| \frac{\widehat{d}(x,y)}{|B(x,d(x,y))|}dy,$$

which completes the proof of (2.2). □

2.1. **The DeGiorgi Lemma.** Here is an infinitely degenerate variation on the DeGiorgi Lemma in Lemma 1.4 of Caffarelli and Vasseur [CaVa], but yielding an estimate different from that of Caffarelli and Vasseur - one that does not involve an isoperimetric inequality.

Lemma 13. *Fix x and r_0 and suppose that w satisfies $\int_{B(x,r_0)} |\nabla_A w_+(y)|^2 dy \leq C_0$. Set*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &\equiv \{y \in B(x,r_0) : w(y) \leq 0\}, \\ \mathcal{C} &\equiv \{z \in B(x,r_0) : w(z) \geq 1\}, \\ \mathcal{D} &\equiv \{y \in B(x,r_0) : 0 < w(y) < 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$C_0 |\mathcal{D}| \geq C_1 \left(\frac{|\mathcal{A}|\,|\mathcal{C}|}{|B(x,r_0)|\, r_0} \right)^2 \geq C_2 \left(|\mathcal{A}|\,|\mathcal{C}| \right)^2. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. With $\overline{w}(y) \equiv \max\{0, \min\{1, w(y)\}\}$ and $\alpha \equiv \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{|B(x,r_0)|}$, we have for $z \in \mathcal{C}$ that

$$1 = \overline{w}(z) \leq C |B(x,r_0)| \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \int_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma(z,r_0)} |\nabla_A w(y)| \frac{\widehat{d}(z,y)}{|B(z,d(z,y))|} dy,$$

and hence that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{C}|\,|\mathcal{A}| &= \int_{\mathcal{C}} \overline{w}(z)\, dz \;\; |\mathcal{A}| \leq C |B(x,r_0)| \int_{\mathcal{C}} \int_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma(z,r_0)}(y) |\nabla_A w(y)| \frac{\widehat{d}(z,y)}{|B(z,d(z,y))|} dy dz \\ &= C |B(x,r_0)| \int_{\mathcal{D}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma^*(y,r_0)}(z) \frac{\widehat{d}(z,y)}{|B(z,d(z,y))|} dz \right\} |\nabla_A w(y)|\, dy \\ &\lesssim |B(x,r_0)|\, r_0 \int_{\mathcal{D}} |\nabla_A w(y)|\, dy \leq |B(x,r_0)|\, r_0 \sqrt{|\mathcal{D}|}\, \|\nabla_A w\|_{L^2(B(x,r_0))} \leq \sqrt{C_0}\, |B(x,r_0)|\, r_0 \sqrt{|\mathcal{D}|}, \end{aligned}$$

since by (1.7) and (1.9), we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma^*(y,r_0)} \frac{\widehat{d}(z,y)}{|B(z,d(z,y))|} dz \leq \int_{B(x,r_0)} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma^*(y,r_0)} \frac{\widehat{d}(z,y)}{|B(z,d(z,y))|} dz \approx r_0,$$

Thus we obtain

$$|\mathcal{C}|\,|\mathcal{A}| \lesssim |B(x,r_0)|\, r_0 \sqrt{C_0 |\mathcal{D}|},$$

or

$$C_0 |\mathcal{D}| \geq C_1 \left(\frac{|\mathcal{A}|\,|\mathcal{C}|}{|B(x,r_0)|\, r_0} \right)^2 \geq C_2 \left(|\mathcal{A}|\,|\mathcal{C}| \right)^2.$$

□

3. Hölder continuity of locally bounded weak solutions

From Lemma 13 above, we obtain the following Hölder continuity result for weak solutions to a homogeneous degenerate equation.

Theorem 14. *Suppose that we have the following Caccioppoli inequality,*

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla_A (\psi u_+)|^2 \leq C \left(\|\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla_A \psi\|_{L^\infty} \right)^2 \int_{B_r \cap supp\psi} u_+^2, \qquad \text{whenever } Lu = 0 \text{ in } B_r, \tag{3.1}$$

for all $0 < r < r_0$, and also that for some $\delta > 0$, we have the following local boundedness inequality,

$$\|u_+\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\frac{r}{2}}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\delta}} \|u_+\|_{L^2(B_r)}, \qquad \text{whenever } Lu = 0 \text{ in } B_r. \tag{3.2}$$

for all $0 < r < r_0$. Then if u is a weak solution to $\mathcal{L}u = 0$ in B_{r_0}, we have $u \in C^\gamma_{\rm loc}(B_{r_0})$ for some $\gamma > 0$.

Proof. This theorem follows from Lemma 15 below as follows. We have

$$\operatorname*{osc}_{B_{\frac{r}{2^\ell}}} u \leq \lambda^\ell \operatorname*{osc}_{B_r} u, \qquad \ell \geq 1,$$

which implies

$$\operatorname*{osc}_{B_t} u \leq C \left(\frac{t}{r_0}\right)^{\frac{\ln \frac{1}{\lambda}}{\ln 2}} \operatorname*{osc}_{B_{r_0}} u, \qquad 0 < t < r_0 \ .$$

Hence $u \in C^\gamma_{\rm loc}(B_{r_0})$ with $\gamma \equiv \frac{\ln \frac{1}{\lambda}}{\ln 2}$. □

Lemma 15. *Suppose that (3.1) and (3.2) hold. Let u be a weak solution of $\mathcal{L}u = 0$ in B_{r_0}. Then there exists $\lambda < 1$ such that*

$$\operatorname*{osc}_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}} u \leq \lambda \operatorname*{osc}_{B_r} u, \qquad 0 < r < r_0.$$

Proof. This lemma follows from Proposition 16 below as follows. Let

$$v(x) \equiv \frac{2}{\operatorname{osc}_{B_r} u} \left\{ u(x) - \frac{\sup_{B_r} u + \inf_{B_r} u}{2} \right\},$$

so that $-1 \leq v \leq 1$ on B_r. If $|\{v \leq 0\} \cap B_r| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B_r|$, then Proposition 16 gives $\operatorname{osc}_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}} v \leq 2 - \lambda_0$, which in turn implies

$$\operatorname*{osc}_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}} u \leq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_0}{2}\right) \operatorname*{osc}_{B_r} u, \qquad 0 < r < r_0.$$

If instead we have $|\{v \geq 0\} \cap B_r| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B_r|$, we obtain the same inequality by applying the above argument to $-v$. Since $\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{2^{3+\frac{|B_{2r_0}||B_{r_0}|}{C\delta^2}}} > 0$ we obtain $\lambda \equiv 1 - \frac{\lambda_0}{2} < 1$. □

Proposition 16. *Suppose that (3.1) and (3.2) hold. With r_0 sufficiently small, let*

$$\lambda_0 \equiv \frac{1}{2^{3+\frac{|B_{2r_0}||B_{r_0}|}{C\delta^2}}} \in (0,1).$$

Let $v \leq 1$ and $\mathcal{L}v = 0$ in B_{2r_0}. Assume that $|B_r \cap \{v \leq 0\}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B_r|$. Then

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}} v \leq 1 - \lambda_0.$$

Proof. Define

$$w_k = 2^k \left(v - (1 - 2^{-k})\right)$$

and let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_{2r})$ be such that $\varphi = 1$ on B_r and $||\nabla_A \varphi||_{L^\infty(B_{2r})} \leq \frac{2}{r}$. Using $\mathcal{L}w_k = 0$ in B_{2r_0} and the Caccioppoli inequality (3.1) we have

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla_A (w_k)_+|^2 \leq \int_{B_{2r}} |\nabla_A (\varphi (w_k)_+)|^2 \leq C||\nabla_A \varphi||^2_{L^\infty} \int_{B_{2r} \cap supp\varphi} (w_k)_+^2 \leq C_0 |B_{2r}| r^{-2} \ ,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $w_k \leq 1$, which in turn follows from the assumption that $v \leq 1$. Also note that $v \leq 0$ implies $w_k \leq 0$, and therefore

$$|\mathcal{A}| = |\{2w_k \leq 0\} \cap B_r| = |\{w_k \leq 0\} \cap B_r| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B_r|. \tag{3.3}$$

We will apply Lemma 13 recursively below with $w = 2w_k$, but only as long as

$$\int_{B_r} (w_{k+1})_+^2 dx \geq \delta, \tag{3.4}$$

where δ is the positive constant in (3.2). We use $\mathcal{A} = \{2w_k \leq 0\} \cap B_1$, together with both (3.3) and (3.4), and the fact that

$$w_{k+1} = 2w_k - 1,$$

implies

$$|\mathcal{C}| \geq \int_{\mathcal{C}} (w_{k+1})_+^2 dx = \int_{B_r} (w_{k+1})_+^2 dx \geq \delta,$$

to obtain from Lemma 13 that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left\{0<w_k<\frac{1}{2}\right\}\cap B_r\right| &= |\{0<2w_k<1\}\cap B_r| = |\mathcal{D}| \\ &\geq \frac{C_1}{C_0\left|B_{2r}\right|r^{-2}}\left(\frac{\frac{1}{2}\left|B_r\right|\delta}{r\left|B_r\right|}\right)^2 = \frac{C_1}{4C_0}\frac{\delta^2}{|B_{2r}|}\equiv\alpha,\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha>0$ depends on r, but not on k or v. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}|B_r| &\geq |\{w_k\leq 0\}\cap B_r| = |\{2w_{k-1}\leq 1\}\cap B_r| \\ &= |\{w_{k-1}\leq 0\}\cap B_r| + \left|\left\{0<w_{k-1}\leq\frac{1}{2}\right\}\cap B_r\right| \\ &\geq |\{w_{k-1}\leq 0\}\cap B_r| + \alpha \\ &\vdots \\ &\geq |\{w_0\leq 0\}\cap B_r| + k\alpha \geq \mu + k\alpha \geq k\alpha,\end{aligned}$$

since $w_0=v$. But this must fail for a finite k *independent* of v, namely k_0 where $\frac{|B_r|}{\alpha}<k_0\leq\frac{|B_r|}{\alpha}+1$, and for this k_0 we must then have

$$\int_{B_r}(w_{k_0+1})_+^2 dx<\delta.$$

By the local boundedness inequality (3.2), we conclude that $w_{k_0+1}\leq\frac{1}{2}$ in the ball $B_{\frac{r}{2}}$. Rescaling back to v now gives

$$\begin{aligned}& 2^{k_0+1}\left[v-\left(1-\frac{1}{2^{k_0+1}}\right)\right]_+ = w_{k_0+1}\leq\frac{1}{2} \\ \text{implies}\qquad & v\leq 1-\frac{1}{2^{k_0+1}}+\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2^{k_0+1}} = 1-\frac{1}{2^{k_0+2}}\text{ in }B_{\frac{r}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally we note that $\alpha=\frac{C_1}{4C_0}\frac{\delta^2}{|B_{2r}|}$ and $k_0\leq\frac{|B_r|}{\alpha}+1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2^{k_0+2}} &\geq \frac{1}{2^{\frac{|B_r|}{\alpha}+3}} = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{|B_r|}{\frac{C_1}{4C_0}\frac{\delta^2}{|B_{2r}|}}+3}} = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{|B_{2r}||B_r|}{C\delta^2}+3}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^{3+\frac{\left|B_{2r_0}\right||B_{r_0}|}{C\delta^2}}} = \lambda_0\ .\end{aligned}$$

□

3.1. **Proof of Theorem 2.** Recall from [KoRiSaSh2, see (2.2)] that if u is a weak subsolution to $\mathcal{L}u=0$, then we also have the standard Cacciopoli inequality

$$\int_B|\nabla_A(\psi u_+)|^2\leq C\left(||\psi||_{L^\infty}+||\nabla_A\psi||_{L^\infty}\right)^2\int_{B\cup supp\psi}u_+^2.$$

We repeat the proof here, which simplifies in the homogeneous setting. From the assumption that $\nabla A\nabla u=0$ in the weak sense we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \int\left(\psi^2u_+\right)\nabla A\nabla u = -\int\nabla\left(\psi^2u_+\right)A\nabla u_+ \\ &= -\int 2\psi u_+\left(\nabla\psi\right)A\nabla u_+ - \int\psi^2\left(\nabla u_+\right)A\nabla u_+\ ,\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\int\psi^2\left|\nabla_A u_+\right|^2 = -\int 2\psi u_+\left(\nabla\psi\right)A\nabla u_+\leq 2\left(\int\left|\psi\nabla_A u_+\right|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int\left|\nabla_A\psi\right|^2u_+^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

hence

$$\int\left|\psi\nabla_A u_+\right|^2\leq 4\int\left|\nabla_A\psi\right|^2u_+^2\ .$$

We now use

$$\int_B |\nabla_A(\psi u_+)|^2 = \int_B |u_+\nabla_A\psi + \psi\nabla_A u_+|^2 \leq 2\left\{\int_B |u_+\nabla_A\psi|^2 + \int_B |\psi\nabla_A u_+|^2\right\}$$

to complete the proof of Cacciopoli. We can now obtain our main result, Theorem 2, directly from Part (1) of Theorem 1 and Theorem 14.

References

[CaVa] Luis A. Caffarelli and Alexis F. Vasseur, *The De Giorgi method for regularity of solutions of elliptic equations and its applications to fluid dynamics,* Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series S, **3**(3), 409-427. DOI: 10.3934/dcdss.2010.3.409.

[Chr] M. Christ, *Hypoellipticity in the infinitely degenerate regime, Complex Analysis and Geometry, Ohio State Univ. Math. Res. Instl Publ.* ***9,*** Walter de Gruyter, New York (2001), 59-84.

[DeG] E. De Giorgi, *Sulla differenziabilit'a e l'analiticit'a delle estremaili degli integrali multipli regolari,* Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino. Cl. Sci. Fis. Math. Nat., **3** (1957), 25–43.

[Fe] V. S. Fediĭ, *On a criterion for hypoellipticity*, Math. USSR Sbornik **14** (1971), 15-45.

[KoRiSaSh1] L. Korobenko, C. Rios, E. Sawyer and Ruipeng Shen, *Local boundedness, maximum principles, and continuity of solutions to infinitely degenerate elliptic equations*, `arXiv:1506.09203v5` (2016).

[KoRiSaSh2] L. Korobenko, C. Rios, E. Sawyer and Ruipeng Shen, *Sharp local boundedness, and maximum principle in the infinitely degenerate regime via DeGiorgi iteration*, `arXiv:1506.01630v1` (2016).

[KuStr] S. Kusuoka and D. Stroock, *Applications of the Malliavin Calculus II*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **32** (1985), 1–76.

[Mor] Y. Morimoto, *Non-Hypoellipticity for Degenerate Elliptic Operators*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **22** (1986), 25-30; and *Erratum to "Non-Hypoellipticity for Degenerate Elliptic Operators",* Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **34** (1994), 533-534.

[Mos] J. Moser, *On a pointwise estimate for parabolic differential equations,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. ***24*** (1971), 727-740.

[SaWh4] E. Sawyer and R. L. Wheeden, *Hölder continuity of subelliptic equations with rough coefficients*, Memoirs of the A. M. S. **847** (2006).

McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
E-mail address: `lkoroben@math.mcmaster.ca`

University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada
E-mail address: `crios@ucalgary.ca`

McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
E-mail address: `sawyer@mcmaster.ca`

Center for Applied Mathematics, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, P.R.China
E-mail address: `srpgow@163.com`